

1877

(R.R.).

File No. 29.

Serial No. 1-2

Sub:- Government Kyot
holding land in Inam
Village.

(35)

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

L. R. 21 of 1876 & 34.

1871
191 .

File No. 29

Serial Nos. 1-2 .

Later references.

(L. R.)

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1 to 2.

cc. Part B for July 1878.

SUBJECT.

Government Ryots holding land in
Inam Villages.

Indexed

Mirza Nazeer Husain

✓

No 349 ~~27~~ 9

21 Orders were passed
on the above, in this office
Pro: No $\frac{5718}{27}$ of 7 Sept 77.

+ No $\frac{482}{79}$ of 8 Aug 77
missing

22. In continuation
of his No $\frac{464}{76}$ of 2nd Aug
last, the Commissioner of
the Nagar Division sub-
mitted a letter from the
Deputy Commissioner of Shingur
in which it was stated
that the village of
Karnigrasu in the Kavale-
Durga taluk having
been settled by the
Siam Department
as a Sirkar village
containing Siam lands,
the allowance of 1 Rupee
deducted in the Jodi in
1876-77 for payment to
the inamdar, would be
included in the pambandi.

of this year. 223

23 The Commissioner was
thereupon requested to
forward the correspondence
which was stated to have
taken place between
the Dy Commissioner and
the Guam Superintendent
on the subject aforesaid.

Docket No. $\frac{5275}{25}$ of 25 Aug 77

No 271.

24 The Commissioner
forwards the correspondence
above requested.

Order under

13 July 77

No $\frac{736}{120}$ of 3 Oct 77.

25 It appears from
this correspondence, that
the Dy Commissioner of the
Shinope District addressed
the Guam Superintendent,
with reference to the
C.C's Pro No $\frac{1}{1}$ of 1st April 76,
and enclosed a list

Asst (257)

No 357 of 3rd June 1877.

243
showing the ~~designations~~
of different minor ~~names~~
in the Classen accounts
and requested to be informed
to what heads under the
new arrangement, these
should be transferred.

26. The same Superintendent
in reply, forwarded copy
of the Statement above
referred to, with a Column
added showing the
respective heads to which
the various descriptions
of mines were to be
transferred. He also
forwarded a printed copy
of the Brief Sketch of
the various descriptions
of mines and of Major
heads under which they

6225
have been classified,
for further information.

27 With reference to
the above, the Dy Commissioner
stated that it was doubtful
in the case of some of the
inams in his District
whether they were whole
village or minor
inams, and, submitting
a statement of whole
villages in the District,
requested to be informed
under what head they
had been brought at
the Inam Settlement.

Kubhari N^o 1328

12 March

28 The Inam Supdt.
stated that 8 Agrahars
in the Sorab taluk and
3 in the She Karpur taluk

Kubhari N^o 1038

~~20~~ 5
had not yet been settled,
& that the Apahans in
the Kanabonipa and
Tajac valleys had been
confirmed as minor
tribes, prescribing
merely the limits and
extent of the tribes.

The Survey Superintendent
also observed that when
the Survey Department
fixes the actual lands
to be confirmed, it may
happen that some of
these become whole
tribe villages and then
they will have to be
considered as such.

Major [?] added that
a reference had been
made to the Survey Dept
to ascertain whether the

627
village of Harigarsa
and Thelaginara were
wholly main, or whether
they contained Sirkar
lands.

29. The Dy Commissioner
then again addressed the
Main Superintendents
stating that as it
appeared from the above,
that Harigarsa was
treated by the Sirkar
as a minor main,
it would have to be
removed from the list
of whole main villages
to the holders of which
a commission had to be
paid for the collection of

Pubkari No. $\frac{385}{335}$ of
28th June 1897

a 287 ~~Quit rent~~ or excluded

minor names in their villages,
submitted to the Chiefdom
with the Nagai Commissioners
No 44 of 17 April 1877 as
the village had been entered
therein under the impression
that it was a whole man,
and enquired ~~that~~
whether it should be
considered as a Sirkar
village.

30. In reply, the Suam
Superintendent stated
all the villages in the
Kavalowaka taluk
except Kureperasu
had been treated as
Suam villages, and that
that village should be
considered as Sirkar

Local Name No 288 of 9 July 1877

10 829

31. Under the ~~circumstances~~ Dr. H. H. H.
stated, the village of Kerasmatu
may be considered as a
Lirhar village and the
allowance of 1 Rupee
deducted in the Joki
of 1876-77 for payment
to the ^{whole} mandas, may be
noted to be included
in the Jamabandi of
this year.

But Humboo Chetty

17 10 77
~~Approved~~

18/10

Dr. H. H. H.

18 10 77

Drafted.

30 32 The ~~Orders~~ ^{that} were passed on
17th & 20th June of this Inst.
the ~~orders~~ in this
Office No: 5718
24
N58 dated 7th Sep/77.

X Letter no 433 of
24th April/78

3.2 The Survey and Settle
ment Commissioner
Mysore, addressed
the Chief Commissioner
stating that para 2
of the order referred
to in the ^{21st} ~~order~~ para
of this memo
may be construed
as being in opposition
to Chief Commissioner's
order no 5935 of 11th
March 1872 whereby
no Ryot hitherto holding
goot land in an Enam
Village can be divested
of his right to continue
to hold under govt and
be placed under the
Enamdar of the Village.
The Survey & Settlement
Commr states further that
there is no difficulty
in a portion of an Enam
Village

Village which may ^{3/4}
be held under govt
being managed by
govt; i.e., the revenue
paid thro' the Village
Authorities to the
Taluk Treasury just
as in a govt Village.
He is quite of opinion
that the course followed
in the Village of Bairan-
halli of the Haripur
Taluk attended to in
the 1st para of the
order under reference
must have been
antecedent to the
Chief Commissioner's
Order No 5935 of 11th
131
March 1922. Colonel
Anderson declares
further that in case
of there being any
lands in an Enam
Village which have
been held directly
under govt as govt
land and have hitherto
paid revenue to govt,
They

2-34
also in the

11/11/22

AR (257)

37 //

They should, under the Chief Commissioner's order alluded to in Para 1 above, be demarcated, surveyed, and ascertained which alone will effectually prevent disputes in the future -

³³ I submit herewith the previous orders quoted by Mr Anderson as also the printed correspondence relating to Anderson.

³⁴ In para 3 of his letter N° 229 of 23 Feb 1772, Col Anderson proposed that, in all cases where Govt have any direct rights over land in any village, that village should be surveyed, and

Similarly no ryot
 holding directly under
 Government should
 by any of the ar-
 rangements of the
 Income Deptt be made
 the subtenant of
 an Inamdar —

35 The above pro-
 posal was ap-
 proved of by Sir
 R. Meade in
 this office No 5935.

7/11 March 1892 R131
 The principle here
 affirmed would,
 I beg to submit, apply
 not correctly
 to Andamanen
 villages in which
 only are situated,
 to a small extent
 extent, Sugar lands
 but not to Jodi'
 or Suramomom
 villages

36 The order, to

(8) 34 ¹³ ~~to which~~ the Survey Com-
~~ttee~~ objection refused
 to certain included
 minor mans, the
 Jodi formerly charged
 on which formed
 portion of the main
 village - or if the
 lands were entirely
 free from Jodi they
 were constituted
 as such in recogni-
 tion of the service
 the holders thereof
 were rendering to
 the Inamdar. It
 seems nothing but
 fair that where
 such mans have
 been presumed the
 whole inamdar should
 on condition of his
 being held liable
 for payment of the
 full assessment

due in the minor ¹⁶ matters
 he entrusted with
 the management of the
 whole village including
 the resumed matters.
 There is no loss to
 Govt of such an
 arrangement. The
 arrangement will be
 made good if the
 landlord whether
 the lands are cultivated
 or not, whereas
 if the lands are
 separately surveyed
 & apportioned the Govt may
 suffer a loss of revenue
 whenever the lands
 may be left unoccupied.

Wm. Lloyd

11/5/78

The principle advocated
 by Col Anderson & approved
 for several terms by the
 C.C. order of 11 March 192
 is undoubtedly a correct one,
 but for the reasons stated
 above, I cannot be thinking
 that the arrangement sanctioned
 by the Chiflains in the case
 of these petty zamindars comprised
 in the village, is advantageous
 to the Govt & to the landlord
 where such petty zamindars
 have held lands in land division
 States by 13/5

say that it seems de-
 sirable for the reasons
 above given to adhere
 to the order which my
 predecessor has passed
 on this subject.

24/6
 ABG

3514

Revised

8-9-385
62192

0368
13

1878

From

The Survey & Settlement Commissioner

Mysore.

To,

The Secretary to the Chief Commissioner,

Revenue General Department.

Dated Bombay 24th April 1878

Section 21
File No 21
Serial No 1

Despatched

Received

29

ENCLOSURES No.

General No. 433
No.

Regarding Government
Rajots holding land
in Enam villages.

To

Director

29-4-78

29-4-78

30/4

(2)

30-4

No. 433 of 1878

From,

Colonel W. C. ANDERSON, Section.

the Survey and Settlement Commissioner Mysore.

To,

THE SECRETARY TO THE CHIEF COMMISSIONER,

for the Government of the Territories of His Highness

the Maharajah of Mysore.

Survey Commissioner's Office

Dated - Bombay 24th April 1878

Sir,

I have the honor to point out that Para 2 of Chief Commissioner's order No. $\frac{5718}{27}$ of the 7th September last may be construed as being in opposition to Chief Commissioner's order No. $\frac{5935}{131}$ of 11th March 1872 where by no. Ryot hitherto holding Government land in an Enam village can be divested of his right to continue to hold under Government and be placed under the

the Enamdar of the village: There is no difficulty in a portion of an Enam village which may be held under Government being managed by Government that is the revenue paid through the village authorities to the Talooka treasury just as in a Government village:—

2. The course followed in the village of Bairanhali of the Hurihar Talooka alluded to in the first Para of the order under reference must have been antecedent to the Chief Commissioner's order No $\frac{5935}{131}$ of 11th March 1872:—

3 In case there are any lands in an Enam village which

which ²⁰ have been ⁴ held directly under
Government as Government land
and have hitherto paid revenue
to Government, those lands should,
~~be~~ under the Chief Commissioner's
order alluded to in Para 1 above,
be demarcated, surveyed and assessed
which alone will effectually prevent
disputes in the future.

Your obedient servant

H. H. H. H.

Survey & Settlement Commission

Mysore

22

b

2

May the
be printed?

Letter no 433 of 24.4.78,
from the Survey and
Settlement Comr. of Mys-
sore, stating that para
2 of the Chief Comr's
Order no $\frac{5718}{29}$ of 7.9.77
is opposed to the terms
of the Ch. Comr's order
no $\frac{5935}{131}$ of 11.3.72.

Order thereon :-

The Chief Comr observes
that the principle ad-
vocated by Coll. Ander-
son and approved of
in general terms by
this Office Pro: no
 $\frac{5935}{131}$ of 11.3.72 is no
doubt a correct one,
but it is more gene-
rally applicable to
Ar dhamanyem Villages
than to godi or Sarvo-
manyem Villages.

2. The arrangements
sanctioned by the
late

5 1872
Government of Mysore
Revenue

To The Commr, Nagar
" Luam Commr.
" Supt of Luam Settlement
By: Commr, Chital
- durg District -

Dated 2nd July
despd
Recd

12 Copies despd
1 To Asstt Secy
2 Famine Commr & Asstt Secy
1 Attached to Draft
18 Reserve
34

No 2482
25

Dr 4 PM.
3-7-78

Observing that the order
of 1872 is more generally
applicable to Ardhamanyan
villages than to fodi or sar-
-vanyan villages & stating
that the collection of revenue
for minor resumed inams
should be entrusted to the
whole inamdar on condition
of his paying the full
assessment due

cluding the resumed
Inams

3. By such an arrange-
ment, there would be no
loss of revenue to Govt.,
for the assessment
will be made good
by the Inamdar
whether the lands are
cultivated or not;
whereas, if the lands
are separately survey-
ed and assessed, the
Govt. may suffer a
loss of revenue when-
ever the lands are
left unoccupied.

By order


Secretary

To

The Commr, Nagar Du.
" " Inam Commr
" " Suptt of Inam
Settlements.
" " Dy Commr, Chittal.
Droog Dist.

10

1878.

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE.

REVENUE.

To

THE COMMISSIONER, NAGAR DIVISION.
" INAM COMMISSIONER.
" SUPT. OF INAM SETTLEMENTS.
" DY. COMMR., CHITALDROOG DISTRICT.

Dated July 2nd.

Despatched - 10th

Received

Regd. 15th

No. 2482.

Rev. 25.

Observing that the Order of 1872 is more generally applicable to ardhmanyam than to jodi or sarvanyam villages, and stating that the collection of revenue for minor resumed inams should be entrusted to the whole inamdar on condition of his paying the full assessment due.

9

*Proceedings of the Chief Commissioner of Mysore, Department of Revenue,
Agriculture and Commerce, 2nd July 1878*

From the Survey and Settlement Commissioner, Mysore, To the Secretary to the Chief Commissioner of Mysore, General Department, No. 433, dated Bombay, 24th April 1878.

I have the honor to point out that para 2 of Chief Commissioner's order No. 5718-27 of the 7th September last may be construed as being in opposition to Chief Commissioner's order No. 5935-131 of 11th March 1872, whereby no ryot hitherto holding Government land in an inam village can be divested of his right to continue to hold under Government and be placed under the inamdar of the village. There is no difficulty in a portion of an inam village which may be held under Government being managed by Government, that is the revenue paid through the village authorities to the Taluk Treasury just as in a Government village.

2. The course followed in the village of Bairanhalli of the Harihar Taluk alluded to in the first para of the order under reference must have been antecedent to the Chief Commissioner's order No. 5935-131 of 11th March 1872.

3. In case there are any lands in an inam village which have been held directly under Government as Government land and have hitherto paid revenue to Government, those lands should, under the Chief Commissioner's order alluded to in para 1 above, be demarcated, surveyed and assessed, which alone will effectually prevent disputes in the future.

29-7-78
2

No. 2482 Rev.—25, DATED BANGLORE, 2ND JULY 1878.

ORDER THEREON.—The Chief Commissioner observes that the principle advocated by Colonel Anderson and approved of in general terms in this office Proceedings No. 5935-131 of 11th March 1872 is no doubt a correct one, but it is more generally applicable to ardhmanyam villages than to jodi or sarvmanyam villages.

2. The arrangement sanctioned by the late Chief Commissioner in order No. 5718-27, dated 7th September 1877, referred to certain excluded minor inams, the jodi formerly charged on which formed portion of the assets of the inam village. Even if the lands were entirely free from jodi, the exemption must have been allowed in consideration of the services the holders thereof were rendering to the inamdar. It seems nothing but fair that, where such petty inams have been resumed, the whole inamdar should, on condition of being held liable for payment of the full assessment due on the minor inams, be entrusted with the management of the whole village including the resumed inams. By such an arrangement there would be no loss of revenue to Government, for the assessment will be made good by the inamdar whether the lands are cultivated or not, whereas if the lands are separately surveyed and assessed, the Government may suffer a loss of revenue whenever the lands are left unoccupied.

+

T. CLARKE,

Secretary.

To—The Commissioner, Nagar Division.

„ Inam Commissioner.

„ Superintendent of Inam Settlements.

„ Deputy Commissioner, Chitaldroog District.

12 Copies despatched

1 To Asst Secy

2 Finance Comr & Adm Secy

1 Attached to Draft

18 Reserve

34